



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,096	03/12/2004	Richard M. Hogan	4022-000014	8094
27572	7590	05/01/2008		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.				
P.O. BOX 828				
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				
EXAMINER				
DESAL, ANISH P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of Box 11:

1. The 35 USC Section 102(b) or 103(a) rejections based on Katsuki et al. (US 4,427,743) are maintained for the following reasons:
2. Applicant argues that Katsuki is not A-B-A composite sheet as recited in the claims. According to Applicant, the meaning of the term "composite sheet" is read in light of its description at paragraph 0031 and 0032. The Examiner respectfully reminds Applicant that while the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, the paragraph cited by Applicant does not provide a "definition" of the composite sheet but merely describe a composite sheet. Additionally, as previously stated the claim language does not exclude other layers (see page 10 of 02/26/07 Office Action). It appears that Applicant is trying to convey that his/her composite sheet has A-B-A layer (i.e. three layers) only. That is inaccurate because the composite sheet could include additional layers other than three layers A, B and A (see claim 27).
3. Applicant argues that the glass sheet and the plastic sheet of Katsuki are not co-extruded together. These arguments are not found persuasive for the reasons set forth at page 6-7 of 08/31/07 Office Action (see product-by-process interpretation of claim language by the Examiner).
4. Applicant argues by referring to Figure 2 of Katsuki that the reference does not suggest that layers 1A/1B/1C form a polymeric expendable layer which is an extruded sheet produced from a thermoplastic polymer of a blend of polymers. Instead, the

Art Unit: 1794

layers are produced from a glass sheet, a plastic sheet, and an adhesive. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears that Applicant intended to refer to layers 1A'/2A'/3A' and 4 of Katsuki (not 1A/1B/1C). Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive because 1A'/2A'/3A' which is equated to the layer A of Applicant includes a plastic sheet 3A', which meets the requirement of A is an expendable polymeric layer. The examiner notes that "an expendable polymeric layer" does not preclude the polymeric layer from being a multiple layer film which reads the 1A'/2A'/3A' film of Katsuki. Accordingly, the art rejections are maintained.

5. It is noted that the specification recites that the expendable polymeric layer is capable of being readily separated from the adhesive layer. The art rejections based on Katsuki may be overcome if such features are incorporated into the claims.

Continuation of Box 13:

1. The 35 USC Section 102(b) rejections to claims 13-17 based on Pedginski et al. (US 5,882,753) are moot, because these claims are cancelled.
2. The 35 USC Section 102(b) or 103(a) rejection to claim 21 based on Pedginski et al. (US 5,882,753) are moot, because this claim is cancelled.
3. The 35 USC Section 103(a) rejections to claims 18-20 based on Pedginski et al. (US 5,882,753) are moot, because these claims are cancelled.

/A. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Hai Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794